

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| ETHEL L. WEST, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| vs. |) | No. 3:13-CV-3993-G-BH |
| |) | |
| DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT, |) | |
| Defendant. |) | Referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge |

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION

Pursuant to *Special Order 3-251*, this case has been automatically referred for pretrial management. Based on the relevant filings and applicable law, the complaint should be **DISMISSED** as frivolous.

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sues the Dallas Police Department (“DPD”) pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. She asserts that her civil rights were violated when DPD officers executed a traffic stop on May 25, 2013, searched her car without her or her husband’s consent, and refused to allow her to use her cane or seek assistance from her husband when she exited the car despite her disability. (Amend. Compl. at 4; Magistrate Judge’s Questionnaire Answers “MJQ Ans.” 2, 6).¹ She seeks monetary damages. (MJQ Ans. 6).

II. PRELIMINARY SCREENING

Because Plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis*, her complaint is subject to judicial screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(b). That statute provides for *sua sponte* dismissal of the complaint, or any portion thereof, if the Court finds it is frivolous or malicious, if it fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or if it seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is

¹ Plaintiff’s answers to the questions in the MJQ constitute an amendment to the complaint. *See Macias v. Raul A. (Unknown)*, Badge No. 153, 23 F.3d 94, 97 (5th Cir. 1994).

immune from such relief.

A complaint is frivolous when it “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). A claim lacks an arguable basis in law when it is “based on an indisputably meritless legal theory.” *Id.* at 327. A complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted when it fails to plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007); *accord Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009).

III. SECTION 1983

Plaintiff seeks monetary damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. That section “provides a federal cause of action for the deprivation, under color of law, of a citizen’s ‘rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws’ of the United States” and “afford[s] redress for violations of federal statutes, as well as of constitutional norms.” *Livadas v. Bradshaw*, 512 U.S. 107, 132 (1994). To state a claim under § 1983, Plaintiff must allege facts that show (1) she has been deprived of a right secured by the Constitution and the laws of the United States; and (2) the deprivation occurred under color of state law. *See Flagg Bros., Inc. v. Brooks*, 436 U.S. 149, 155 (1978); *Cornish v. Corr. Servs. Corp.*, 402 F.3d 545, 549 (5th Cir. 2005).

Plaintiff names the DPD as the sole defendant. (Amend. Compl. at 1; MJQ Ans. 1). A plaintiff may not bring a civil rights action against a servient political agency or department unless such agency or department enjoys a separate and distinct legal existence. *Darby v. Pasadena Police Dep’t*, 939 F.2d 311, 313-14 (5th Cir. 1991). In *Darby*, the Fifth Circuit held that “unless the true political entity has taken explicit steps to grant the servient agency with jural authority, the agency cannot engage in any litigation except in concert with the government itself.” *Id.* at 313. A city police department not a jural entity subject to suit. *See Darby v. Pasadena Police Dep’t*, 939 F.2d

311, 313-14 (5th Cir. 1991); *Edwards v. Dallas County Jail Med. Dep't*, No. 3:07-CV-0886-G, 2007 WL 2687615, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 13, 2007); *Magnett v. Dallas County Sheriff's Dep't*, No. 3:96-CV-3191, 1998 WL 51355, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 20, 1998). Plaintiff's complaint against the Dallas Police Department should therefore be dismissed.²

IV. RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff's complaint should be **DISMISSED** with prejudice as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

SIGNED this 18th day of February, 2014.


IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT

A copy of these findings, conclusions and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these findings, conclusions and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. See *Douglass v. United Servs. Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).


IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

² The MJQ specifically advised Plaintiff that the Dallas Police Department is a non-jural entity and provided her an opportunity to add additional defendants. She chose not to add additional defendants. (MJQ Ans 1).